

REMARKS

Claims 3-16, 20-21 and 24-25 remain unchanged and are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner and the Supervisory Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during a telephonic interview on November 13, 2008. During that interview, the Examiner and the Supervisory Examiner agreed that Gräser does not disclose the claimed "handling right determining means" in claim 4 and thus overcomes the pending rejections.

ABSTRACT

The abstract stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the abstract according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3-16, 20-21 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gräser, "Technological Solutions to Autonomous Robot Control" (1998). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 recites:

handling right determining means for determining, on the basis of said information stored in said database, whether or not said article handling

subject has a handling right of said article in response to an identification result about said article obtained by said article identifying means and an identification result about said article handling subject obtained by said article handling subject identifying means.

Applicant submits that Gräser fails to anticipate the above limitations.

Gräser at best appears to show a rehabilitation robot for elderly and disabled people. Applicant, however, can find no mention of features that are analogous to the claimed handling right determining means.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 4, and its dependent claims 3 and 5-16, define over the art cited by the Examiner.

Independent claims 20 and 24-25 each recite features similar to the distinguishing features of claim 4. Therefore, independent claim 20 and its dependent claim 21, as well as independent claims 24-25, define over the art cited by the Examiner for one or more of the reasons set forth above regarding claim 4. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 26, 2008

By: /Timothy D. MacIntyre/
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42,824

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/TDM/dec